

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated May 17, 2005.

Claims 2-7 and 9-15 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Funaba et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,411,539 B2, in view of Park et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,409 B2.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended, in part, to provide that “the motherboard transmission line [has] ... a branch point connected to the connector in which the memory module is inserted, no signal reflection occurring at the branch point and at an end portion of the memory module.” Similarly, independent claim 8 has been amended to provide that “a motherboard transmission line [has] ... branch points connected to the respective connectors, no signal reflection occurring at any of the branch points and at any end portions of the memory modules.” The amendments to claims 1 and 8 are supported in the specification by, for example, page 11, lines 17-19, and by page 13, lines 28-29.

In contrast, neither Funaba et al. nor Park et al. discloses, teaches or suggests such features.

Specifically, in Funaba et al. signal reflection at branch points appears to be implicitly assumed when it is stated that, “Since memory modules are branch-connected to a bus on a motherboard in the case of a memory system related to a comparative example having an SSTL interface, which is shown in FIGS. 11 and 12, for example, stub resistors are placed every branches to cope with undesired signal reflection,” (column 14, lines 21-26) (emphasis supplied).


In connection with Park et al., Park et al. does not disclose that there is no signal reflection at the branch point and the end portion of a memory module, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 8. Only signal reflection at the memory controller 41 is stated to approach zero, (column 4, lines 33-50; Figs. 6A and 6B).

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1 and 8 is respectfully requested.  
Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 28, 2005:

Max Moskowitz  
Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Representative  
Signature  
July 28, 2005  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Max Moskowitz  
Registration No.: 30,576  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MM/MIM:lac